

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/748,509		12/26/2000	Koji Hayashi	10449-030001	4131	
26161	7590	04/20/2006		EXAMINER		
FISH & RIC	CHARI	DSON PC	СНИ, КІМ КЖОК			
P.O. BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				2627	2627	
				DATE MAILED: 04/20/2006	DATE MAILED: 04/20/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		09/748,509	HAYASHI ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Kim-Kwok CHU	2627				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Or period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period or to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timused and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	I. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. C (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 M	arch 2006.					
2a)	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.						
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	on of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 3-9 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 3-9 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or						
Applicati	on Papers						
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accent accent any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	epted or b) objected to by the Eddrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
Attachmen		🗖 .					
2) Notic 3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:					

Obvious Type Double Patenting

doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting assignees. rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 3-9 provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 3-9 of copending Application No. 09/748,400. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 3-9 of the 09/748,400 Application includes all limitations in claims 3-9 of the present Application. The only difference is the wording of the claimed languages. For example:

(a) In the preamble, the present invention claims a controller for controlling interruption and restarting of data writing to a recording medium. On the other hand, the 09/748,400 Application claims a data recorder for writing data to a recording medium. Since a data recorder achieve data access/record operations with read/write interruption and restarting routines, the present Claims 3-9 are not patently distinguishable to the Claims 3-9 of the 09/748,400 Application.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

3. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300 (for formal communications intended for entry. Or:

(571) 273-7585, (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed USPTO Contact Center (703) 308-4357; Electronic Business Center (703) 305-3028.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kim CHU whose telephone number is (571) 272-7585 between 9:30 am to 6:00 pm, Monday to Friday.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kim-Kwok CHU Examiner AU2627

Ge 4/17/06

April 17, 2006 (571) 272-7585 ` THANG V. TRAN